



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

makes his father believe that the latter has actually taken the leap and that his life has been preserved by a miracle. As in the *Lazarillo* we have a blind man deceived by his leader into taking a leap wholly different from the one he proposes. Here the resemblance ends. In the one case the deceit is prompted by malice; the injury, even the death, of the blind man is sought. In the other the imposture is inspired by filial piety, and the aim is to bring the blind man out of his despair by means of a pious fraud. This episode may represent a union of Sidney's story with the "blind man's leap" story; but of course this is speculation difficult of proof. I merely offer this as a suggestion to Professor Wagner for use in the comparative study of the story which he has promised.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Comedia Famosa de Las Burlas Veras de Ivlian de Armendariz.*

Edited by S. I. MILLARD ROSENBERG, Philadelphia, 1917.

Pp. 206. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.

Department of Romanic Languages and Literatures.

The ideal dissertation should open fields for farther investigation, and it is always a pleasure to see new fruits resulting from an old study. Mr. Rosenberg, after publishing as his dissertation *La Española de Florencia o Burlas y Amor Invencionero*, has given proof of continued zeal by making accessible two other equally important works whose similarity of title had led bibliographers into hopeless confusion. The second of these was *Las Burlas Veras* of Lope de Vega; the third, with which we are now concerned is a play of the same title by Julian de Armendariz. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it is the sole surviving play of one of Spain's minor dramatists, of whose work we had hitherto known little. The play itself is mediocre; it interests principally for its vivid scenes of student life.

In the first three chapters of his introduction, R. discusses the whole cycle of plays, repeating much that he had said in previous studies. The facsimiles in this volume had also been printed previously. One sees at once that R. still clings to his more than doubtful theory that Calderón wrote *La Española de Florencia*, in spite of A. L. Stiefel's arguments to the contrary. All will agree that the absence of a title in the Veragua list is no proof that Calderón did not write a given play. But in this case Calderón has expressly denied the authorship. A heavy burden of proof rests upon one who would father this foundling upon an author who denies its parentage, and R. offers nothing but subjective impressions, and similarities of style. Many after reading the play are equally confident that Calderón did not write it. The situation is the same as regards *La tía fingida*. Many scholars think they detect in this story undoubted traces of Cervantes' style; others are equally confident that the master never wrote a line of it. Now it may well be doubted if the authorship of any work can be determined on the basis of

style alone. *La Española de Florencia* is still of doubtful authorship. Stiefel, too, has not proved his case for Lope, though his argument is the more plausible of the two. The high authority of Morf, who sides with R., does not decide the question.

Chapter IV contains a brief biography of Armendariz, the best available. Other chapters discuss the play now edited. The weakest part of the study is the text itself, which has been edited with an absolute lack of critical method. On p. 167 the editor lists a number of words (*sigun, seguro, sigundo, quesiera, elusion, piadad*, etc.) which he terms "curious misspellings," thereby betraying a curious ignorance of Spanish dialects. He should have made a detailed study to solve the question whether these are Leonisms, such as a Salmantino like his author would have been likely to use, or whether they are dialect forms due to the scribe of the Parma MS here reproduced. In the poem, *El Patron Salmantino*, reprinted in the appendix, Armendariz writes pure Castilian. If R. had consistently substituted Castilian forms for dialect, such a method might be defended. Yet it seems safer to reproduce carefully the MS, correcting errors. This R. pretends to do: "The orthography of the MS has been scrupulously preserved, except that the punctuation has been modernized and that homonyms, interrogative pronouns, and the future and past definite tenses of verbs have been accented." (p. 61). But neither this system nor any other discoverable one has been consistently adhered to. Comparing text with the one page of facsimile, we find that *beras* is twice printed as *veras* (in the case of many other words with initial *b* the change has not been made) and *quesiera, quisiera*. One wonders how much more modernization there has been without indication in the footnotes. Dialect forms are often retained in the text, even when considered misspellings, and quite as often relegated to the footnotes. The clearly erroneous form *escribó* for *escribió* is retained, the very common *seguro* rejected. Sometimes the same form is treated differently at different times. Thus the MS reading *escuro* is retained (verse 1252) and changed to *oscuro* (verse 1426). A more complete lack of system is hardly to be conceived of.

The editor also makes mistakes of scansion. Verse 995 reads: *a que te sient[e] a su mesa*. The addition of the *s* destroys both sense and meter. The line: *o tortearéle la cara* is not wrong. The verb is a coinage which should give no difficulty. Syneresis of *ea* is common in other verses. But how about R's proposed emendation: *o torturaréle la cara*? Here there is one syllable too many. The following errors have also caught my attention: 499, read *hablado* for *hallado*, as the sense demands. Make the following two lines a question. 600, the phrase *Peor está que estaba* is a common expression. It is not necessary to suppose with R. that its use here implies the existence of a play by that title antedating this play and Calderón's well-known comedy, even though it does seem certain that Luis Alvarez wrote a like-titled play previous to the work of Calderón. See Schmidt (*Schauspiele Calderón's*, pp. 31 ff.). 659, the change of *lo* to *le* is unnecessary and wrong. 682, wrong: the MS reading is correct. 1163, *quel ruydo [a] ya pasado*, the

"*vocal embebida*" *a* should be placed after *ya*, not before it. 1255, *pues yo entro*. *Ve seguro*, change *ve* to *vete*, as suggested in the note. The hiatus is unlikely. 1564-5, make these lines a question. 1802, ¡*Santo, en gracia!* ¡*Santa Ynes!* Nonsense. Read: *Santa Engracia*, etc. 1934, *obligado* is a misprint for *obligada*. 2106, emendation wrong. Retain the MS reading. 2226, note, *esbribió*, a misprint. 2299, retain *estella*. 2482, *dará dichoso fin*, etc. *Dará* is an emendation for *dire* of the MS. Read rather *diere*: the context demands a subjunctive. 2645 and 2652, retain the MS readings.

It would be unfair to convey the impression that R. has not made some good emendations. There is also much of value in the notes, even if these are often too elementary in character. Scholars, to whom alone the volume is addressed, do not need to be informed that *diabro-diablo*, *ynorancia-ignorancia*, *bergudo-verdugo*, etc. The literary portion of the present study is far superior to the linguistic.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Les Œuvres de Guiot de Provins, poète lyrique et satirique*. Editées par JOHN ORR. Pp. lv+206. Manchester: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1915.

This is an excellent edition of the complete works of a French poet of the time of Philippe Auguste, a poet who, after attempting a career as professional singer in the seigneurial courts, turned monk, first at Clairvaux and then at Cluny, and who, moreover, saw something of life in Palestine during the Third Crusade. The works consist of five chansons, the *Bible*, which falls into two distinct parts, and a short religious meditation formerly published as a *Suite* to the *Bible*, but now more accurately entitled *L'Armeure du Chevalier*.

One-fifth of Guiot's *Bible* (the word seems to be used in the sense of "epitome of wisdom") is a lengthy lamentation upon the decadence of the French nobility from such as the author knew it in his youth: an interesting list of 86 of his supposed benefactors is passed in review, patrons renowned for prowess and generosity, kings, dukes, and lesser notables, "the like of whom the world will never see again." Under Philippe Auguste, and largely as a result of the two crusades, the social order was evidently changing; the monarchy was growing rapidly at the expense of the provincial courts; centers of culture like those for which Crestien de Troyes had written had entered upon a decline, the prestige of the University at Paris meantime increasing the influence of the national capital. Guiot, discouraged by the prevailing "avarice" and the decadence of patronage, had no choice but to go into a monastery. Here, however, he was no better off, and the remaining four-fifths of the *Bible* is a lively satire on the regular clergy, with some attention at the end to the foibles of theologians, lawyers, and doctors.

The work of editing the *Bible* from two rather poor manuscripts has been done with care; Mr. Orr had the advantage of the advice of Professors